



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

A SERMON,

&c.

LUKE XXIII. 34.

"Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

ON this fifth Sunday of Lent, the Church begins her more explicit reference to that which is the culminating point of all the penitential exercises of the season—the view of human sin by the light of that suffering which could alone expiate it, the Passion which opens the Easter of our redemption. In the Epistle which the long usage of the Western Church assigns to this day, we hear of that One spotless Victim whose blood accomplished what no sacrifice of the ancient law could effect, the cleansing of the conscience from guilt: and in the proper lessons which our own branch of the Church has attached to the Sundays of Lent, we are now first from the book of Exodus introduced to that object, of the old Paschal celebration that was the type of ours,—Israel's redemption from Egyptian bondage through the blood of sprinkling and the parted sea. On this "Passion Sunday" therefore, as it was once commonly termed, our attention may not inappropriately be called to the prayer uttered by the true

Lamb of God when He was nailed to the cross. Of the many topics of meditation which it might well supply, there is one only on which I now propose to dwell particularly;—one not without its own painful historical interest,—nor without profitable application to ourselves individually and collectively, as members of His mystical body by baptism. May the Spirit of Him who prayed for his murderers, direct, hallow, and purify every thought which the mysteries of His unspeakable charity suggest to us, and prosper each to its good practical effect.

The topic on which I propose to enlarge is this: that the murderers of our Lord were quite unaware of the character of their own act; that an ignorance resulting necessarily from the manner in which they chose to look at the religious matters surrounding them, was the real source of the fearful crime in which they involved themselves. For what Christ here said on the day of His Passion, was said also by His divinely-instructed chief Apostle a few weeks after, in the season of Pentecost, “Brethren, I wot that *through ignorance* ye did it, as did also your *rulers*.” Not the common Jews only, the unlettered and uninstructed among them, but the chief-priests, the scribes, doctors, and elders knew not what they did in this unequalled atrocity: “had they known it,” says another Apostle, “they would not have crucified the Lord of Glory.”* This matter therefore deserves our attentive study in its causes no less than in its consequences: we may well inquire how such ignorance was possible among persons so privileged as

* Acts iii. 17; 1 Cor. ii. 8.

they were, so surrounded with every means for knowing and appreciating the great truth that was addressed primarily and almost exclusively to the body over which they legitimately presided.

The cause may, I think, be traced to one single point, one which the Lord's own parable concerning it may enable us to express concisely and clearly. These husbandmen of divine appointment deported themselves in God's vineyard as if it were theirs; the polity and framework of holy ordinances committed to them, they treated as subjected, in all respects of its management, to their view of what was expedient for themselves and the apparent interests of their community. As a trust from a higher Power and Wisdom, expecting its fruits in season, and looking for simple fidelity in the deposit as they received it from Him,—thus they did not care to consider it. The men that were sent from time to time to remind them of their true relation, they ever treated with despise and contumely: but when One came with authority unclaimed before, presenting to them, under their circumstances at the time, no apparent alternative, but of either submitting their views to His entirely, or ridding themselves of Him, they decided as we well know. The speech "This is the heir, come let us kill him, and the inheritance shall be ours," was no other in the actual facts of the history represented by the parable, than what we read of the council held after the raising of Lazarus from death.* There the general voice was, "If we let this man alone, all men will believe

* Mark xii. 1-8; John xi. 47-53.

on him, and the Romans shall come and take away both our place and nation :” and a voice was then heard among them that said, “ Ye know nothing at all, nor consider that it is expedient for us that one man should die for the people, and that the whole nation perish not.” It is not the occult sense that is now before us, in which a higher intelligence than that of the unworthy son of Aaron moved his unknowing lips to prophesy a divine truth ; it is the intent and policy of the speaker that is now before us ; and in that view this speech of Caiaphas, coupled with the general alarm which it was to obviate, may express to us the whole object of the Jewish rulers in their rejection and condemnation of our Lord.

Was then the danger which these men professed to foresee one utterly chimerical or imaginary ? Or was their concern for the public safety in reference to it altogether assumed and hypocritical ? There is nothing that should make us so think. These men were certainly wise in their generation : they were well able to mark, in all ordinary affairs, the processes of popular feeling, and the crises or collisions that they might precipitate : accordingly there is little or no doubt but that the public interests, as presented to their minds, actually seemed to compel the course they adopted : and though that course did indeed bring on their heads, and that almost by natural consequence in its process, the very evil they would avoid ; there is no reason to think their speculation different from what the same circumstances might easily suggest as the safest to other minds than theirs. No necessity is there even for imputing

to all these men much of personal malice at the time when this resolution was adopted: no more of direct ill will was probably theirs at first than what men of worldly views constantly feel at those whose aims are different, and so cross their own: there were among them, as we may easily believe, several who would have willingly abstained from sanguinary measures, if the apprehensions they felt could have been equally stilled by milder methods: and moreover (which is far the most fearful part of the case), once supposing their worldly feelings so strong as to shut out from their perception the Divine character of Jesus our Lord, there was nothing in Religion as it was then popularly understood, or as surveyed by themselves, to forbid, and not rather to sanction their proceedings, even in the horrible charge of blasphemy. While there were many religious sects in the nation, of conflicting sentiments, and angrily contending for pre-eminence, the fact is as undeniable as it is awful, that several of the most influential of these were found concurring in this politic judgment of the high-priest, and the proceedings that arose from its adoption.

They indeed were a small number, but still not deficient in respectability or influence among the rulers and the aristocracy, that avowedly limited all their expectations to the present life; and because the sanctions of the Mosaic law were all temporary, asserted that there was no deeper eternal object couched under the law; and that the promise to the fathers was, like the law, earthly altogether; confined to the possession of Canaan and the con-

quest of enemies, with peace and affluence and prosperity in its train. *They* again were of more preponderating authority, and in far greater esteem with the multitude, who attached an eternal character to the law itself which distinguished them from Gentiles, while they amplified it by innumerable traditions of their own; who, while they held against Sadducees the resurrection of the just, believed its coming felicity to be only an extension into another world of the triumph over heathens which the Messiah the Son of David should procure them in this. And while both these sects would bitterly feel the loss of national independence and subjection to the Roman power, the Pharisee especially would consider tributary subjection to the Gentile as involving something religiously degrading and polluting to a freeborn child of Abraham. And while all these whom I have yet mentioned would look anxiously to the expected heir of David's throne for better days; there was another party yet, the Herodians, who would rather make the best of their existing circumstances, and attach to the reigning family of Jewish religion, who had the support of Roman power, the hopes which the others reposed in the coming Christ. We may well conceive how men of all these descriptions would concur in the fear expressed lest the nation at large should follow the wonder-working Teacher of Galilee: how unwelcome to them all must be the fact, that while He, without earthly resources of any kind, disclaiming them markedly and totally, and commanding all men to look beyond these, was yet drawing the hearts of

the people to himself as the expected Son of David; they, the wealthy, the learned, the powerful, who were the proper depositaries of these cherished national hopes, but who were altogether confounded and disappointed by such a claimant of Messiahship as the present,—*they* should have to answer to the haughty representative of Cæsar for this dreaded excitement of the Jewish people. With minds thus viewing the subject, and having no disposition or apparent capacity for any other view, can we wonder at these men's apprehension that the Romans should come and take away their place and nation? Can we wonder at their attempting to use the authority of the meek Master himself to silence the unwelcome acclamation of the multitudes hailing Him as Son of David; and that failing,—the meek Master Himself approving, and telling them the stones would cry out if these were silent, and assuming His place as Lord of the temple itself before their eyes,*—do we wonder, on the known principles of human nature, at their effort to reverse the popular feeling? And this they indeed did effectually; when a foul treachery enabled them to present this same expected King to the senseless and fickle multitude, bound, buffeted, and helpless under indignities.

Now is this exposition of the ignorance of rulers as well as people on this occasion, of a nature to excite sympathy in their favour, or to lessen the abhorrence with which all generations of Christendom have ever regarded them? Assuredly not. For the determined bent of the mind to one view only of

* John xii. 19; Luke xix. 37-40; Matt. xxi. 12-16 and 23-46.

an object set before it, is never without moral quality of some kind, when that object is of any moral bearing whatsoever: and there are circumstances that stamp a guilt of no ordinary character on this blindness of the Jewish ruler. The prophecies of the ancient Scripture which might most exalt his conceptions of the external grandeur of Christ's kingdom, abounded in circumstances to rectify them also: he would not have stumbled at that stumbling-stone, had he preserved in faith and prayer a mind attuned to the moral sublimity of his own Scriptures, and had a heart sufficiently clear from the mists of worldly pride to discern in Jesus of Nazareth that character which ever won the simple and honest minded, in proportion to their simplicity and integrity, whatever their hopes or their prejudices may have been. The power which controlled the elements was of a higher character than any earthly royalty: to remove sickness, infirmity, and death itself by a word, bespoke a grace and majesty which the highest worldly potentate might envy: and it was by works of beneficence no less than of might that the Prophets announced the kingdom of the Messiah as distinguished: nor were they silent concerning His rejection or His sufferings as the sole entrance to His future glory. It could be no other than a most culpable prejudice that blinded the well-read Scribe and Pharisee to truths so prominent in the Scriptures in which he gloried; whether that prejudice proceeded, as in the case of Saul of Tarsus before his conversion, from the strength of early association acting on an impetuous temperament,

or rather, as in the greater part, from less respectable causes than this,—from pride or covetousness or other selfish affections, obscuring the mental perception of the great Light that would reprove them. Still as it is the nature of ignorance, really such, to extenuate in some degree the guilt of the wrong conduct resulting from it, (for so St. Paul remarks of his own case,—so St. Peter states in his address to these very priests and rulers,*—and so our blessed Lord Himself in the prayer “forgive them, *for* they know not what they do”,) we may justly assign to this ignorant rejection a character less flagrant in wickedness than that of sinning against light known and recognized; though in proportion as the moral disorder accumulated, it verged ever more and more towards that most heinous and diabolical character. When the Spirit of God came with power through the Apostles upon the world, many of these murderers were visited with the grace of true repentance of heart, and through the efficacy of His blessed intercession, saved even from their fearful guilt by the blood which they had themselves wickedly shed. It was only when that new Divine Agent was resisted and blasphemed, that their sin was sealed to be of that character and heinousness which has no forgiveness in this world or the next.

If then the exhibition of Incarnate Godhead on earth be that which has brought into most distinct view the evil with its remedy, and the character not only of the heirs of salvation but of those of

* 1 Tim. i. 13; Acts ii. iii. &c.

perdition; surely this most fearful example is not without its instruction and warning to the end of time. It warns of the danger *all* must incur who judge of things belonging to God and His truth by the measures of worldly policy or expediency; and they especially in our own age, who avowedly ignore the question, as if it did not concern them, of the truth or falsehood of a belief, when speculating on the consequence of its being entertained by others; as did Caiaphas and his conclave, when discussing their countrymen's faith in the Lord's miracles. And we learn assuredly how little are the real interests of God's people regarded in counsels thus instituted and thus directed: while we see how this method of protecting the valued polity of Judaism from heathen invaders proved in the issue of things its utter ruin; and the higher blessing of the world which was educed by the good providence of God from their evil counsel, was effected only to the utter confusion of the counsellors.

Such is the lesson of universal import deduced from the case of the Jewish rulers especially, who unknowingly crucified their King. And since I have thus considered the divine judgment of our Lord in His prayer, only with reference to them to whom it was principally though not solely applicable, suffer me further if, for what remains of this discourse, I consider the relation of the ruling power in states to His religion, who may yet be crucified afresh (as is the constant language of His own Apostles) by the apostacy, or even the lesser sins and scandals of His members. The subject is not

an unsuitable one to an audience like the present: and in considering it let me not be understood by any means as imputing to every instance, in which our great lesson may be even perilously disregarded, the flagitiousness of the conspirators at Jerusalem: let me, once for all, sincerely and seriously disclaim such intended imputation: for the caution, though scarcely necessary in itself, may be not unrequired at the present time by more classes than one amongst us. And this said, let us consider, as we are bound to do, in its fulness of general applicability, the lesson of which it has pleased God to afford us that extreme example.

It took three centuries for the powers of this world to acknowledge the invincibility of a cause against which they had essayed their utmost strength in repeated persecutions before; and by their own incorporation into the Church, to make kingdoms of this world, remaining such, to be kingdoms of God and of His Christ. The station which Christian princes then assumed was the same analogously as that which the godly kings of the ancient economy held with respect to the sacred things of Mount Sion and Jerusalem: and on the principles of this there was then no difficulty or controversy in the Church, even when the details of things appeared least smooth or satisfactory. There were debates respecting the faith, on which the Emperors did not quite participate the sense of vital essential importance which the Bishops of the Catholic Church attached to the points at issue: on one of these questions, there were emperors found to take the

side of heresy: yet was the principle acknowledged on all hands, that it was not for temporal authorities in any instance to define or determine the doctrines which Christ and his Apostles had fixed in the Church, but only to order and rule in all temporal respects what was already fixed and determined. When the matter of divine belief required to be settled, neither the Catholic Constantine or Theodosius, nor the Arian Constantius or Valens, thought of deciding it otherwise than by Synods of the Church in her own appropriate offices and powers; that is, by Synods of Bishops, to whom by Apostolic authority and ordinance belonged the right of feeding and governing, and of judging matters purely spiritual, in the household of faith. Whatever earthly passions may have been mixed with the discussion of such topics, whatever the aberrations of individual minds in their views of them, there was no difference as to the principle that the faith is one, as Christ's Church is essentially one; that the question what was or what was not admissible under that character could never be determined by the rules of human policy, or the balancing of conflicting interests, but by the sure and simple and all-applicable rules of judgment on which the Church has proceeded from the beginning.

For the last three centuries it has been the boast of the Anglican Church to have restored to our Sovereigns the ancient rights of Christian princes in convoking Ecclesiastical Synods, and otherwise ordering the affairs of religion in their dominions, as nursing fathers and nursing mothers of the Church.

And assuredly the same reverent spirit that animated a Theodosius or Justinian towards institutions and dogmas that flowed from no earthly power, has not been wanting to the monarchs of these realms. No Articles of Religion have been hitherto set forth under Royal authority, but such as had been fully debated and agreed on and sanctioned by the Archbishops and Bishops of both provinces: and it is far too evident to need proof to any one, that if the promulgation of new statements on matters of faith requires the sanction and cognizance of those in whom spiritual jurisdiction is lodged, no less so must the definition of the sense in which existing statements are received. The two things are in effect and character identical; inasmuch as the Catholic faith is but one, in whose explication alone any dogmatic statement can consist, if it be sound and trustworthy. And in proportion, therefore, to the importance of any Article in the scheme of Christian doctrine, must be the solicitude of all Catholic Christian men that its definition be not tampered with. And if such an attempt were ever made in the name or behalf of the Crown of these realms, so that from the definition thus imposed there should be *in foro exteriori* no appeal, this would be to every such Christian among us a grievance no less than intolerable; one that placed the dues of Cæsar and the dues of God in an attitude with respect to each other that has never existed from the last settlement of religion amongst us until now.

My brethren, I state this as hypothetical: for we may not, we must not surely regard it otherwise at present. What more sacred in the eyes of Christians than the holy

Sacrament of Baptism?—the laver of regeneration, the very application from the opened side of the Saviour, of the saving virtue of His passion, and the quickening power of His resurrection, to the soul that before this lay under the pollutions of the first Adam and the birth in sin?—the step which in the sanctification of the Christian has no step before it, and can have none? What more unhesitating than the faith with which we desire each Christian child to repeat that he was *then* made a member of Christ, a child of God, an heir of heaven? for in proportion to his faith in this, is his apprehension of the infinite love that has made him such, preceding all worthiness and all effort on the part of man. To teach otherwise to him who had placed no *obex* in the way of Christ's sacrament of mercy,—to infuse the poison of doubt into the streams of the blessed fountain ever opened for sin and for uncleanness,—this were equally to corrupt and destroy the whole foundation on which Christian education rests, and leave nothing but what were either self-presuming or fanatical to take its place. For the very essence of Christian truth in its subjective application to the catechumen is this; that the same initial grace which the elect of God pursue to their final salvation is that which the reprobate Christians resist and lose at last: no otherwise is he effectually warned against realizing the latter character, and instructed to press after the full apprehension of that for which he has been himself apprehended by divine goodness, the prize of his high calling in Christ Jesus: no otherwise is he instructed in watchfulness and diligence to seek from God, in addition to the grace of the first conversion,

the grace of progress, the grace of final perseverance; while to him who has by continual neglects and wilfulness utterly lost the grace of his baptism, no after renewal is, in the Apostolic language, possible.* These are principles of the doctrine of Christ, on which there is no variation or disagreement wherever the Catholic faith has been received: the highest predestinarianism of the school that followed St. Augustin in the Western Church is in full logical consistency with this statement; in which our Catechism, eschewing all high or difficult points, follows the stream of pure Christian teaching from the beginning. And all the unspeakable support and blessing of such teaching is marred, in proportion as the fatal dogma of a novel school is introduced into its place; the dogma that would represent saving grace, once given, as never lost; which therefore renders doubt of the initial grace a positive duty on the part of every one who has not made himself sure of his final salvation; the source of awful presumption on the one hand, or of dark despair on the other. From the prevalence of such a system, and from the noxious fruits it has ever brought forth when unchecked by the near contact of an older and purer faith, may God of His infinite mercy preserve—(I say not our Church, but) our nation. May England,—the abode of Bede and Anselm, of Herbert and Hooker and Wilson,—never have to look for her spiritual religion to the pseudo-hagiology of Covenanters, or the camp-meetings and revivalism of another hemisphere!

* Phil. iii. 12-14; Heb. vi. 1-6, &c. &c.

Those surely know not what they would do, who would seriously attempt to make those opposite systems amalgamate with each other; or what is equivalent to amalgamation, would represent both as equally compatible with our hallowed formularies. It is not however the strangeness of the attempt I mean—though that if assayed on any subject than religion would probably appear absurd to most men; nor is it again unacquaintance with the topics of theology that we have chiefly to censure here. It was indeed surprising to find any one who appeared as judge on such a question, citing a passage concerning “prevenient grace”—a phrase familiar to most well instructed Christians as denoting that grace which goes before the will and turns it to good,—quoting it, I say, as an authority for a strange figment taking the same name, of which the author and inventor has, I believe, convinced scarcely any one beside himself; a grace going not before the will but before baptism, and doing all which the Church imputes to the grace of baptism; a grace of the bestowal of which we have no assurance, except that it seems, it is given infallibly to all infants that die baptized before committing actual sin! This has indeed too well prepared us for a document in which we find extracts from our holy Fathers and Bishops utterly misunderstood, and produced in support of a sentiment against which some of them are known to have earnestly contended. Would that even this were all that we had to deplore in this attempt at amalgamation! Would that this were all the oversight with which it is chargeable!*

* See Note p. 24.

They are most eminently unaware of what they do, who seek peace by compromise in any matter of essential doctrine whatever it be. Amiable as the intention may be, often most strongly contrasted in that respect with the acts that called for the Saviour's prayer; yet even to this are His terms most strictly applicable: for in no way may His sacred truth be crucified more effectually than in this. It is false charity, even to those whose errors are equalized with truth, which for that purpose would unfix the safeguards of the Catholic faith, or impair the distinctness of our Church's witness to its perpetuity. The presence of that truth thus witnessed is beneficial in various ways even to those who lie beyond the Church's pale; as well as to those who, in the confusions of recent opinion, occupy ambiguous and undefined ground within. Our brethren unhappily separated from our communion would lose much that now happily serves to retain them in the portion of truth they hold, were we brought down to their level; *i.e.* were the Church established in these realms dislodged from the ground on which it has hitherto stood of unvarying Catholic tradition, and reduced to that character which it is the effect of these schemes to impart to it, as but one of the countless sects of Protestantism. And there is one effect of measures like these of which the promoters evince little consciousness, but of which we may well implore God of His mercy to make them duly sensible; I mean the effect produced on thousands of pious and sensitive spirits among us, whom the denunciation of all real, definite doctrine on the fundamental point of Holy

Baptism will seriously, nay reasonably, disturb. And it need not be told what is that body which will then with the best chance of success court these disturbed spirits to her embrace. Those, however, who know not the fact may now be assured of it; that there are none whose tone is at this moment so exulting, so sanguine of a rich gathering of spoil from this source, as the votaries and the emissaries of Rome.

And one word therefore would I now address, in conclusion, to those who may need admonition on that topic. If security of ground for faith be the object of your aspirations, pause I beseech you and consider well whether you can hope to find these in a body which is so wholly without power, even if possessing the will, to repress the idolatrous tendencies of the human heart, and thus prevent an ever widening gulf and abyss of error from absorbing the truth that is there retained. Were our tokens of Christ's presence even more obscured than for our sins they now seem; if even, which God of His infinite mercy avert, the ambiguity with which we are threatened were to be accepted as a ruled interpretation of law by a majority of our spiritual rulers or people; would your position be mended by taking refuge in a communion that is about at length to define as Catholic truth, what to all the best ages of the Church was avowedly unknown, and what the last of the Fathers denounced as perilous and most superstitious? Is it safe—instead of what is indeed the holy Virgin's prerogative, for which all generations term her blessed, the sole immaculate *maternity*—to embrace what is directly subversive of that Catholic truth, and place her

as a successor, as it is almost now avowed, to what were once considered the exclusive honours of her Divine Son, and what, by God's grace, we will ever so consider? Abandon not then the mother which has borne you and nourished you with the Sacraments of Jesus Christ: regard her not with ungrateful aversion for that which should rather move your sympathy, and make you resolve not to desert her. Our spiritual governors are reminding us that it is not the time to leave the ship when the storm is raging and^a a leak has been sprung: it is the time for increased exertion, for more vigilance, and for penitent persevering prayers. Let us ask of Him who hath brought this Vine from heathendom and strengthened and fixed it among us, who has caused it to send forth shoots and branches to the utmost corners of the earth, that He will not suffer its hedge of holy discipline to be broken, its branches torn, its fruits devoured by those who know not what they do; but that first restoring us personally and individually to His obedience, He will restore our Church also. "Turn us again, LORD God of hosts. Shew the light of thy countenance, and we shall yet be whole." *

* Ps. lxxx.

NOTE.

Mr. Gorham states in the 15th of his published *Answers to the Bishop of Exeter's Questions*—"I hold that no spiritual grace is conveyed in Baptism except to *worthy recipients*; and as infants are by nature unworthy recipients, they cannot receive any benefit from Baptism, except there shall have been a *prevenient act of grace* to make them worthy." The statement is repeated over and over again in the *Answers* and in the pamphlet.

The actual bestowal of this prevenient grace is regarded by Mr. Gorham as altogether uncertain and problematical, with respect to the mass of those who are required in the words of the Catechism to declare themselves children of grace by virtue of their baptism. But with respect to "children which are baptized dying before they commit actual sin," (whose certain salvation, in consequence, is asserted in the Rubric in terms too clear to be eluded,) he declares in answer to several questions that he considers the said prevenient grace to have been infallibly, indubitably, and effectually conferred upon *all* these.

Now of this "prevenient grace," i.e. grace going *before baptism* to do what all orthodox Christians believe to be wrought by grace given *in baptism*,—the learned counsel for the Bishop of Exeter had good reason to say, on the fourth day of the Appeal case, that he had never heard of it before seeing it in Mr. Gorham's book; that it does not seem to be "either Roman or Anglican or Catholic or Protestant, or any thing else." He little thought of the flood of light that was to usher in the fifth day; when the unguarded assertor was rebuked by a quotation from the eleventh book of the "*Paradise Lost*" concerning "prevenient grace," turning the stony hearts of the first sinful pair, and infusing the spirit of prayer!

The noble lord who sounded his *Eureka* on this occasion, is, I believe, as extraneous to the communion on whose doctrine he was sitting in judgment, as was the anti-prelatical poet from whom he produces some equally correct and beautiful lines. But it is not his fortune to live in the poet's age;—an age when some knowledge of the rudimental terms of theology was possessed by laymen even far less learned than Milton; and where divine grace in its relations to the human will as preceding, accompanying or following, was a topic on which common lawyers were not wont to be wholly ignorant. We could scarcely better describe the miserable heresy of the person whom the quotation was to aid than by the very term in question: viz. as being a determined denial to baptismal grace of that *prevenient*, (in the Miltonian, *i. e.* the true sense) which is distinctly attached to it in Holy Scripture, and in the never-failing teaching of the Church, with respect to all the filial acts of the Christian soul.

If a similar unacquaintance with the terms of statute law were evinced by a magistrate administering it, we may imagine the light in which his adjudications would be viewed by this same really learned lord, who now so deservedly occupies the highest place in his profession. Assuredly the effects of incompetence are no less manifest here, where they are infinitely more disastrous. It is melancholy to see Hooker and Taylor and Pearson ranged on the side of a heresy which they have confuted, and which the last has classed with Socinianism, by the most thorough misconception, as well as misquotation and perversion, of insulated passages from their writings: while Ussher is brought into the same arena by fathering on him a writing which he distinctly disclaimed.*

* A work has been already published in our University on this matter, "A Brief Vindication of Jewel, Hooker, Ussher, Taylor, Pearson, from Misrepresentations in the recent Baptismal Judgment. By a Fellow of a College." The masterly Letter of the Bishop of Exeter, which has appeared since this note was written, is unanswerable on this as on all other points connected with this most unhappy Judgment.

But it is far more melancholy to see doubt thrown on what was once clear, by a judgment coming under the highest temporal auspices: a judgment in which the Church cannot silently acquiesce, and retain its place as a portion of the Catholic body.
